

## **EXHIBIT 1**

1

1

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION

2

3

) CASE NO: 20-33163

4

CEC Entertainment,

)

) Houston, Texas

5

)

) Thursday, October 8, 2020

Debtors.

)

6

)

) 3:43 p.m.- 6:02 p.m.

7

)

-----)

8

## TRIAL

9

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARVIN ISGUR  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

10

11 APPEARANCES:

12

For The Official  
Committee of  
Unsecured Creditors:

JASON ADAMS  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178

14

15

For Kimco Realty  
Corporation, Site  
Centers Corporation  
and Various Other  
Landlords:

MICHELLE SHRIRO  
Singer & Levick PC  
16200 Addison Road, Suite 140  
Addison, Texas 75001

17

18

For Wilmington Trust,  
National Association,  
as Indenture Trustee:

JASON ANGELO  
MICHAEL COOLEY  
Reed Smith LLP  
811 Main Street, Suite 1700  
Houston, TX, 77002-6110

20

21

For The Official  
Committee of Unsecured  
Creditors:

TODD A. ATKINSON  
Womble Bond Dickinson (US) LLP  
811 Main St Suite 3130  
Houston, TX 77002

22

23

For Debtors:

MATT BARR  
SCOTT BOWLING  
CLIFFORD CARLSON  
PAUL GENENDER  
ALFREDO PEREZ

24

25

1 (indiscernible) given that -- (indiscernible) didn't know  
2 that (indiscernible) due to (indiscernible) often happens  
3 (indiscernible), that's all we have. We (indiscernible)  
4 again in this argument. Thank you.

5 THE COURT: Thank you. Any other opponents? All  
6 right. Probably makes the most sense to go to Mr. Rubin but  
7 if the debtor wants to address issues first that's fine.  
8 Mr. Rubin, why don't you - - I'm sorry, go ahead. Mr.  
9 Carlson, go ahead.

10 CARLSON: So Your Honor, the objections really come down to  
11 objection to specific terms, they want me to cut a deal  
12 negotiated heavily by the debtors. We (indiscernible) and  
13 Mr. Walters helped the (indiscernible) process, reached out  
14 to several different parties including the committee and the  
15 (indiscernible) crew and ultimately negotiated a deal that  
16 included these protections here, subject to (indiscernible)  
17 surcharge.

18 And you know, I've seen (indiscernible) --  
19 negotiations were done in the package and the 506(c)  
20 surcharge (indiscernible) other protections were provided in  
21 exchange for the DIP lenders offering to provide the \$200  
22 million in financing and the use of (indiscernible) cash in  
23 these cases.

24 And so you know, given that background and sort of  
25 what the debtors -- the debtors are seeking approval that

1 (indiscernible) we thought it was a fair deal and we fought  
2 hard for it, and to the (indiscernible) request of the Court  
3 for that and an order within (indiscernible).

4 THE COURT: Mr. Carlson, if we were to order the  
5 debtors to establish a \$13 million catch-up reserve next  
6 week, is that consistent with what your rights are under the  
7 DIP order?

8 CARLSON: If we are permitted to do a \$13 million reserve for  
9 catch-up payments?

10 THE COURT: Right, if I ordered it -- when this  
11 money gets funded, that you take 13 million and you put it  
12 into a reserve next week so that you then have it for the  
13 November rent catch-up payment, does that in any way violate  
14 any of your obligations under this DIP order?

15 CARLSON: It may violate -- well, taking a look at it, it may  
16 violate communications on (indiscernible) that, in paragraph  
17 21 that provide limitations on use of (indiscernible). It  
18 would not be necessarily consistent with our budget in that  
19 paragraph. But I think that is (indiscernible) the DIP  
20 order probably would not allow for that.

21 THE COURT: So Mr. Rubin, let me ask you a couple  
22 questions. I'm not sure that it would violate the terms but  
23 I'm not sure it wouldn't if I were to order that the debtors  
24 go ahead and establish a \$13 million reserve for those  
25 catch-up payments. That would eliminate a lot of the

4           And then the second question that I have for you  
5   about a change in the order -- and I am worried despite the  
6   fact that I said to Mr. Adams that doesn't prohibit you from  
7   doing things, it just prohibits you from getting paid for  
8   it. It would seem to me that the committee has to get  
9   funded by the debtors, and that if they're doing their job  
10   that doesn't include a challenge to your lien position or a  
11   suit against you all up until the point of default.

12           That that language can largely be eliminated just  
13    by adding language at the beginning of it that says prior to  
14    the event of a default they can be -- or after an event of  
15    default they can't be paid for these things and they can  
16    never be paid for suing you. I don't see much injury to  
17    your client because we all know that the professional fees  
18    have to get paid in the case.

19                   And it is a bit distasteful to do it -- I don't  
20    know that it's wrong, I don't know that I shouldn't approve  
21    it and I'm not -- trying not to dictate to you, but just  
22    kind of raising those two questions for you as maybe  
23    reasonable actions to take at this point.   What's your  
24    reaction?

25 MR. RUBIN: Sure, Your Honor. Jason Rubin from

1 Akin Gump. I'm on behalf of the DIP lenders. I will take  
2 your questions in order. First question, Your Honor, is if  
3 the Court were to request or order that the debtors need to  
4 provide a \$13 million reserve for rent in order for the DIP  
5 lenders to be given the 506(c) waiver, I do believe that is  
6 something we could agree to.

7 We do believe that testimony that was presented to  
8 the Court today clearly demonstrated by the \$200 million,  
9 should be more than sufficient to pay operating expenses  
10 while (indiscernible) expense claims and all (indiscernible)  
11 landlord claim and all the (indiscernible) fees throughout  
12 the case. But if Your Honor confirmed and would like to see  
13 a reserve established in order to grant the 506(c) waiver, I  
14 believe that is something we would be okay with.

15 Your second one Your Honor, there is no intention  
16 of the DIP lenders or the pre petition secure parties to  
17 restrict the ability of the committee to do what committees  
18 need to do to represent their constituents. As Your Honor  
19 noted, there are certainly a lot of words on that page but  
20 the limitation that -- as you summarized it is probably  
21 accurate, as you said (indiscernible) our clients in a  
22 general sense.

23 We added language at the committee's request to  
24 the DIP order in paragraph 21, we did -- that may clear that  
25 -- per their prosecution and preparation of their objections

1 to the DIP motion were not intended to be covered by the  
2 restriction on investigation matters. That's here in the  
3 red line in paragraph 21.

4 Similarly, Your Honor, you know, prosecution  
5 (indiscernible) objection, again, we would not expect the  
6 (indiscernible) subject to the committee investigation but  
7 if that's set forth in paragraph 21, so potentially Your  
8 Honor, you know, we could work on the language. That was  
9 not the intention and I can represent that.

10 And then lastly, myriad language at the end of  
11 paragraph 21 that does make (indiscernible) that in the  
12 extent there are expenses incurred that (indiscernible)  
13 challenge (indiscernible), this is not prejudicing the right  
14 of the committee to have those expenses paid under our  
15 (indiscernible) bankruptcy code.

16 THE COURT: Yeah, I just -- and I appreciate that  
17 language. I want to be sure that there isn't -- and I'm not  
18 suggesting your clients were doing this. I want Mr. Adams  
19 not to feel that level of leverage on your clients' part.  
20 And I appreciate the fact that your client would be willing  
21 to make those two changes.

22 I think that the evidence is pretty overwhelming  
23 that this DIP ought to be approved. And although I have  
24 additional objections to those that have been resolved by  
25 agreement I think, by three principle agreements, I find

1     that this DIP is necessary and in the best interest of the  
2     estate.

3             The fact that the DIP wasn't taken down in the  
4     beginning and that the debtors have used their money to  
5     operate with seems entirely appropriate to me. The fact is  
6     that on the 13 week budget which no one contests, next week  
7     the debtor will drop below its \$25 million optimum cash  
8     reserves if the DIP isn't funded immediately. And we will  
9     jeopardize this business and jeopardize the jobs and  
10    jeopardize any more point of recovery for the various  
11    creditors in the case.

12            The lenders can't be charged for the  
13    administrative expenses in the case. They can't be charged  
14    for the losses of the debtor that are the routine losses  
15    that aren't directly related to their collateral. And the  
16    fact is, this estate's going to lose in cash flow over \$100  
17    million during the course of this bankruptcy case.

18            Are we funding too large of a DIP? No way. We  
19    are in wholly uncharted territory for the United States and  
20    maybe for the world in terms of what's going on. We know  
21    the money is needed next week in some amount, and the fact  
22    that the forecasts don't show that all \$200 million will be  
23    used doesn't mean that this debtor from a stability point of  
24    view doesn't need additional money. It needs pretty much as  
25    much as it can get in order to assure its stability and



1 ability to emerge as a going concern business.

2 I find that the DIP should be approved and it  
3 should be approved in full with the three changes that we  
4 have talked about. So just to run through those and then  
5 we'll get an order uploaded that does that, number one is  
6 there will be a remedies provision added. Number two is  
7 that there will be, out of the first \$100 million of  
8 funding, \$13 million set aside out of which the debtors may  
9 pay all of their catch-up payments in order to bring the  
10 landlords current.

11 That does not excuse the debtors from any  
12 additional obligation to bring them current. It doesn't set  
13 an amount -- if that turns out to be in excess of what is  
14 needed, the debtors can then put it into their regular bank  
15 account. But that reserve will be inviolate until those  
16 amounts are paid.

17 And then the third change is I just want cleaner  
18 language to be sure that the UCC can do its job without fear  
19 of leverage. And I think those have all been agreed to by  
20 the lenders. I should say for the record that I think my  
21 role is either to approve or not approve the DIP. I can't  
22 approve it and impose additional conditions. And so these  
23 three conditions that I am now requiring are done because  
24 the lender has agreed to it.

25 As to whether I would have approved this without

1 the lenders' agreement to those things is a different  
2 question. But my choice is either approve or don't approve,  
3 it isn't approve and then print something on it because the  
4 lenders have volunteered in terms of advancing additional  
5 money.

6 They've done this voluntarily at this -- as  
7 voluntarily as they can be when asked a question like I  
8 asked. They've still done it voluntarily and solved the  
9 problems. So I'm going to approve it. Mr. Carlson, can you  
10 -- I think this needs to be done tomorrow. Can you work on  
11 this -- I hate to do this to you overnight during the storm  
12 if it comes in, and get an order uploaded tomorrow that I'll  
13 be able to sign tomorrow?

14 MR. CARLSON: Not a problem (indiscernible).

15 THE COURT: All right. I want the landlords to  
16 tell me -- one landlord lawyer that Mr. Carlson can consult  
17 with. I want Mr. Adams signing off with it and then one of  
18 the landlord lawyers. Can you all designate one person that  
19 can consult with the rest of you all so that Mr. Carlson's  
20 not having to deal with six people all with identical  
21 interests?

22 THE COURT: Let's volunteer Ms. Roglen, Your  
23 Honor.

24 MR. RUBIN: That's fine with me, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Ms. Roglen?

1 MS. ROGLEN: That's fine for me as well, thanks.

2 THE COURT: Yeah, I'll have them confer with you.

3 I do think this resolves your objection as I understand it  
4 as well, and I hope that -- it's not what you asked for but  
5 I think it's actually better than what you asked for. So.  
6 Hopefully you all can agree.

7 MS. ROGLEN: I think it's a very (indiscernible)  
8 Your Honor.

9 MR. ADAMS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you.

10 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else  
11 that we need to get done tonight? Okay, thank you. I know  
12 it's been a long day for you all and I know I started a  
13 little bit late just from other hearings, so. I appreciate  
14 your courtesies towards me. We will go ahead and adjourn  
15 for the night. I'll get an order in tomorrow.

16 CARLSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Mr. Carlson, if you will contact Ms.  
18 Stowe the minute that gets filed, I'll need to get that done  
19 tomorrow and I want to do it right away on an emergency  
20 basis.

21 CARLSON: We'll do that, thanks, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Thank you all. Good night, everyone.

23 MR. RUBIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

24

25 (Proceedings adjourned at 6:02 p.m.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from  
the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the  
above-entitled matter.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Sonya M. Ledanski Hyde". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Sonya Ledanski Hyde

Veritext Legal Solutions  
330 Old Country Road  
Suite 300  
Mineola, NY 11501

Date: October 16, 2020